DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 051 CG 005 812

AUTHOR Krasnow, E. Judith; And Others
TITLE Aggressive Behavior: Research in the Modification of Teachers' Attitudes.
INSTITUTION Alexandria Community Mental Health Center, Va.
PUB DATE [68]
NOTE 29p.
AVAILABLE FROM E. Judith Krasnow, DSW, Director, Training and Staff Development, Alexandria Community Mental Health Center, 720 North St. Asaph Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314. (No price is quoted.)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.55
DESCRIPTORS *Aggression, Emotionally Disturbed, *Inservice Education, Inservice Programs, *Inservice Teacher Education, Mental Health Clinics, Mental Health Programs, Misbehavior, Socially Deviant Behavior, Student Behavior, Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Workshops

ABSTRACT

Assessment of the format and content of a teacher in-service program on the aggressive child is the topic of this study. The program was presented by the Alexandria Community Mental Health Center to 284 elementary teachers from the local community. The teachers were asked to fill out pre- and post-workshop questionnaires regarding their expectations for the workshop and their attitudes about aggressive children. Although the data gathering method was inadequate for making definitive statements regarding attitude change, several issues were illuminated by the questionnaire. Teachers were pleased with the format but disappointed in the theoretical content of the workshop, thus raising the question of whether mental health staffs can shift from their need to deal with the theoretical to teachers' needs for receiving direct technical guidance in classroom management of the aggressive child. It also posed the question of whether the mental health staff should be the agent to provide this type of in-service program to teachers. (TL)

ED 043051

AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR: RESEARCH IN THE MODIFICATION OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES

E. Judith Krasnow, DSW, Director, Training and Staff Development of The Alexandria Community Mental Health Center

Jane H. Thayer, Ph. D., Clinical Psychologist of The Alexandria Community Mental Health Center

Edward H. Weiss, M.D., Director, Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Program of The Alexandria Community Mental Health Center

The authors wish to express their indebtedness to Mr. Andrew Lee Jackson for his invaluable assistance with the statistical computations and his helpful suggestions regarding the data analysis.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CG 005 812

AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR: RESEARCH IN THE MODIFICATION OF TEACHERS' ATTITUDES

E. JUDITH KRASNOW, JANE H. THAYER, EDWARD H. WEISS

I. Introduction

Consultation services are the backbone of the preventive program of any community mental health center. For several years, the staff of the Alexandria Community Mental Health Center has offered a variety of consultation services to the public schools of the community. The consultations offered were either the traditional case-presentation approach where teachers, principals, and guidance counselors presented problems of students for discussion, or the consultee-centered approach which helped teachers examine their own behavior provoked by the student.[3]

Since consultation to the schools had been offered for several years, it was decided to evaluate this need objectively to determine the usefulness of this program to the consultees. Therefore the consultees were asked to respond anonymously to questionnaires to help the Center in planning its consultation program for the following year. Responses to the questionnaires revealed that the majority of teachers preferred a didactic workshop approach rather than the case-oriented format. The topics most frequently suggested as areas for discussion were the aggressive child and the underachiever.

The Center's Education Committee met with representatives of the 14 elementary schools in the Fall of 1968 to choose a topic and decide on the format. All present indicated a desire for a workshop on the

aggressive child, to be held on an in-service training day so all could attend and decided on a format which included a keynote speaker, followed by small discussion groups to be led by a mental health professional.

The Education Committee, upon the recommendation of the group, spoke with the school administration personnel who fully cooperated in planning the workshop as an in-service day program. Because of the large number of teachers in the elementary schools, two workshop sessions were planned: one in January '69 for seven of the schools, and one in March '69 for the other seven schools, hereafter referred to as Workshop #1 and Workshop #2, respectively.

School personnel were included in the planning phases of each step. Arrangements within the school system were handled by the school administration, who informed all teachers about the workshops. The Center's responsibility was to provide the keynote speaker and discussion leaders. We held several training sessions for discussion leaders consisting of reporting on articles [2, 4, 5, 6, 9] dealing with the dynamics of aggression in children and the handling of discipline in the classroom. Discussion leaders were provided in advance with an outline of the keynote talk given by Mr. Merle Van Dyke, Assistant Professor of Special Education at George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Since this was our first attempt at a large workshop approach, we decided to evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop to help our staff in planning future consultative and educative efforts in the community. With this in mind, we constructed a questionnaire to be given to all

workshop participants to assess:

1. the expectation of teachers regarding the workshop;
2. their current attitudes towards the aggressive child and towards classroom management for the child; and
3. change in these attitudes following the workshop.

II. Method and Procedure

Study Population

The population of this study consisted of 280 elementary school teachers (first through sixth grades) from the 14 public schools of Alexandria. Two workshops identical in structure were presented (January 30 and March 20, 1969). The teacher population (140) of the first workshop was from the seven eastern, downtown schools of Alexandria. The teachers (140) of the more suburban western areas of Alexandria attended the second workshop.

Questionnaires

All the teachers were asked to complete a questionnaire, anonymously. The questionnaires contained three sections of multiple choice design. The first section evaluated the workshop experience. The second section dealt with assessing teachers' attitudes about personality characteristics of the aggressive child. The last section pertained to management techniques.

Procedure

The format design of each workshop was identical: a forty-five minute keynote speech, and ten discussion groups (an hour and a half in length),

not to exceed 14 participants in each group.

The content of the keynote address focused on the following:

1. an overview of historical concepts of aggression, from analytic theory to a behavioral model approach;
2. broad types of aggression including the active, acting-out and passive-aggressive child;
3. the implications of these types for the teaching-learning process; and
4. the pattern and predictability of aggression, as well as the effects of the physical and phenomenological milieu on the behavior of the child.

The teachers of Workshop #1 received the entire questionnaire one month after the workshop. To maintain the anonymity of the responder, self-addressed envelopes were included. The teachers attending Workshop #2 were asked to respond to the sections of the questionnaire dealing with teachers attitudes about aggressive children and management techniques approximately two weeks prior to the workshop. Each of these pre-workshop questionnaires was numbered. The teachers were asked to record the number of their questionnaires as it would be needed later. After the workshop, questionnaires with all three sections, which now included the part dealing with the evaluation of the workshop experience, were handed to each teacher by their group leader to be returned in the self-addressed envelopes supplied. The teachers were asked to record at the top of this questionnaire the number they had received on their pre-workshop questionnaire, again

maintaining anonymity of the responder but enabling comparison of pre-and post-responses dealing with attitudes and management ideas.

Data Collection and Evaluation

Ninety-seven questionnaires or 70% of the questionnaires were returned by the teachers attending Workshop #1. From Workshop #2, 119 teachers or 85% returned the pre-workshop questionnaires, 50% or 70 responded to the post-workshop questionnaires; however, only 28 of the 70 teachers (or 40% of the 70) had remembered their numbers. Therefore, only these teachers could be evaluated as a matched group in terms of change in attitude following the workshop.

Frequency counts of the responses to each question were tabulated within each workshop and across the two workshops. Chi Square tests were performed on the frequency counts for each question in order to establish the significance (or lack of significance) of the responses at the .05 level of confidence. Where the cell count exceeded five, intergroup comparisons were made of pre-and post-responses in accordance with the use of the Chi Square test (Seigel).[8] Where frequencies were less than five, a Fisher Exact Probability test was performed to determine significant differences in pre-and post-response direction.

III. Results

Expectations of Teachers Regarding the Workshop

The majority of teachers were pleased with the topic and format of the workshop. Eighty-seven per cent of the respondents stated that the

subject of the aggressive child was the one they wished to discuss. Over 3/4 of the teachers (79%) liked having the workshop as part of in-service training. Approximately 70% approved of the format of speaker first, followed by small discussion groups.

With respect to teachers' expectations as to what they would gain from the workshop, the majority focused on understanding more about dealing with the aggressive child. However, whereas 78% expected to gain insight into the teacher's role in dealing with aggression, only 1/3 (34%) believed that their expectations were fulfilled. Almost two-thirds (61%) of the teachers expected to learn about the teacher's relationship with the aggressive child. Twenty-five per cent expected to learn new ways of classroom management. Only 16% believed that they actually did learn new ways. Whereas, a little more than half the teachers (51%) expected to learn about what motivates the aggressive child's behavior, less than one third felt their expectations were fulfilled. It was only in two areas, getting a chance to speak with other teachers about common problems, and learning about the dynamics of aggression, that the expectations of the teachers were fulfilled to a larger degree.

The teachers were disappointed in the workshop in several areas. Seventy per cent wanted more help in understanding the teacher's role in dealing with aggression. Over one third (37%) desired more information on what motivates the aggressive child. The same percentage of teachers preferred more time to question the speaker for clarification. Many of the teachers desired more concrete information on curriculum management.

With respect to their participation, almost two thirds of the teachers rated their participation in the workshop as active.

Suggestions from the teachers varied as to the format and content of future workshops. Of those responding to this question, several recommended that more concrete information be presented about dealing with behavior and dealing with specific problems. Some wanted more structured small group discussions with smaller groups and more direction from the group leader. Generally, comments focused on making the workshop more relevant to teachers' specific problems and with more information given by the "experts."

Attitudes and Management

A Chi Square test of significance was performed on the data dealing with teachers' attitudes toward the aggressive child for each question on the frequencies of response across the three possible replies (yes, no, undecided). Table I presents the frequency distribution for the total post sample (Jan. 30th and post March 20th groups) for each question, the direction of response and level of significance reached in the final one-sample Chi Square test between the two (i.e., yes, no) largest response categories. (See Appendix for Table I)

Therefore, it may be stated with statistical confidence that teachers feel that the aggressive child is:

Lonely	Sensitive
Anxious about his behavior	Perceptive
Inconsiderate of others' feelings	Intelligent

Rebellious

Enjoying his acting-out behavior

A bully

Unhappy

Disliked by others

Selfish

Difficult to handle

Having trouble controlling behavior

Without confidence

Feeling adults are mean

Not bound to fail

Not a hopeless case

Not brain damaged

Not poor in athletics

Concerned about what others think of him

Difficult to understand (what causes his behavior)

Not easy to control

Not a scapegoat

Sensitive to teachers' feelings about him

Able to do academic work

Unsupervised at home

Uncomfortable with his behavior

Table II presents the significant direction of response for each of the forty questions for the January 30, the pre-March and the post-March groups. (See Appendix). Comparing responses of our January and March group, we found they were similar in their response on attitudes.

Composite Picture of Teachers' Attitudes

Teachers do not see the aggressive child as less intelligent than the other students nor do they feel organic cerebral dysfunctioning is an important determinant of aggressive behavior. Most teachers view the child as being perceptive and capable of doing the school assignments. They are inclined to be sympathetic towards the child when they think of what inner feelings the child experiences. Thus they feel the aggressive child

is a lonely, unhappy individual, concerned with what his peers and teachers think of him. Many view the child as being sensitive as well as anxious about his behavior.

But when teachers deal with the child's object relationships, they tend to reverse themselves and less sympathetic responses emerge as they regard the child as a bully, selfish and disliked by others. A number of teachers feel the child receives satisfaction out of his rebellious behavior. In contrast to their previous feelings regarding the child's sensitivity and concern over peoples' opinion of him, he is now regarded as inconsiderate of others. It was of interest to find out that many teachers who thought the child was uncomfortable with his behavior nonetheless felt he had no control over it. Yet, no statistically significant difference allowed for the possibility of organic "brain damage" factors as a source of this lack of control problem.

In viewing the child's home life, the teachers felt that although the child was not necessarily from a poor academic background, he was probably unsupervised at home and that a lack of structure pervaded his home environment. As for the teachers' problems with this type of child, the results pitifully point to the overwhelming sense of frustration in trying to understand why the child behaves as he does. No matter what they try, the child does not respond to the teachers' help when it is offered.

In spite of all the difficulties, teachers are not ready to give up on the child; they neither see the child as hopeless nor necessarily bound to be a failure in life.

Matched Sample

In respect to our matched group, which was the only group that could be evaluated in terms of change in attitude response from pre to post, only on one question was there a significant change in direction of response after the workshop experience. (See Table III in the Appendix). On the pre-March 20 questionnaire, the majority of the teachers responded "yes" to "aggressive children are usually bullies." However, on the post questionnaire, a significant number changed their response to "no." It is perhaps presumptuous to make any definitive statements about the effect the workshop may have had upon any change or lack of change in attitude for the total teacher population, as this matched sample was too small.

Management

Chi squares were also performed on the responses to the eighteen management questions. Of the total post group responses, fifteen of the eighteen questions pertaining to the management of the aggressive child reached the .05 level of significance. The direction of the significant response to each question across the total post sample is presented in Table IV. The significant responses indicate that teachers would handle the aggressive child by:

Not sending him home

Not trying to ignore him

Not yelling at him to stop

Not physically holding him until he stops

Speaking to their supervisor about the problem

Talking to the child alone about his behavior

Talking to his parents

Not asking other students to handle the problem

Not being permissive

Making provisions for special activity

Not removing him from the classroom

Having him seen by the principal, guidance counselor and pupil personnel services

Being strict

Being Kind

It is noted in a comparison of statistics across the three groups (Table V), that in these fifteen significant responses there were no reversals in direction of response (yes vs. no) across any of the three groups. Table VI presents the results of the 2X2 Chi Square tests and (where the cell frequencies were below five), the Fisher Exact Probability analysis performed on the responses to the eighteen management questions in the twenty-eight correlated pre and post questionnaires. None of the statistical evaluations revealed significant changes on the management questions for the matched groups. (See Appendix).

Composite Picture of Teachers' Management of Child

The varieties of ways to handle this type of child in the classroom as seen by the teachers reflect the high level of frustration in selecting any one method that is always effective.

Their handling of the child ranges from speaking to him alone to sending the child out of the classroom to the principal or guidance counselor. No teacher feels there is any advantage to purposely ignore the child, but neither do they feel yelling at him nor physically holding the child to be any use either. Their main feeling is that it is necessary to be kind but

"strict" and certainly "not permissive." Many feel giving the child special attention including having special activities available to him during the school hours is a useful tool to have available to teachers.

The concept of having some support from their immediate supervisor to go to for help when faced with crises presented by an aggressive child is also an important and desirable choice. There was no desire on the teachers' part to send the child home for his disruptive behavior. But at the same time, although other students are observers of the interchange between a disruptive student and his teacher, the utilization of these other students in the classroom as a buffer zone for the aggressive child is not part of the armamentarium used by teachers in their management techniques.

IV. Summary and Conclusions

The results of the questionnaires indicated that the teachers overwhelmingly approved of the structural aspects of the workshop; yet the majority were disappointed with the content that was presented. The majority had anticipated a didactic approach in which they would learn about concrete management techniques for dealing with the aggressive child. On the other hand, the focus of the workshop from the mental health personnel point of view was non-directive, a group dynamic orientation in which no specific management technique was advocated and an avoidance of "recipe" type discussions prevailed. The objectives of the keynote address and the small group discussions were to look at aggression as an interpersonal phenomenon, to explore the teacher's role in dealing with aggression in the social milieu of the classroom, to stimulate the teachers to explore their

feelings about the aggressiveness of the acting-out child, and to look at the meaning of the aggressive behavior. Thus, there was a difference in expectations between the teachers and mental health personnel. The latter were not aware of the specificity of teacher's expectations prior to the workshop, although the teachers and other school personnel were involved in the planning.

The responses to the questionnaires would suggest that future workshops might be perceived as more useful by teachers if the focus was on translating the theory regarding the aggressive child's behavior into classroom practices. It was unrealistic to expect that teachers could become involved in understanding the dynamics of aggressive behavior, when they were more concerned with the "what to do, how to do" approach of dealing with the child. The mental health person, however, was reluctant to translate behavior and motivational theory into mechanical solutions which should not be applied indiscriminately to every child. The results of the workshop pointed out the failure of mental health persons to apply the cardinal rule in working with people; i.e., accept and start where the client is and then move to mutually acceptable goals. This raises the question of whether mental health staff are the best persons to lead a workshop and discussion groups for teachers. Teachers are used to planning and presenting material in a more structured, formal manner, focusing upon the acquisition of knowledge and skills and, therefore, expect something similar from a workshop. By contrast, many mental health personnel are geared to a less structured approach.

Since teachers prefer conferences oriented to concrete management solutions, behavior modification techniques, the life-space interviewing

of Redl or role-playing might meet this need. Although it is questionable whether any of these techniques alone will suffice for the teachers, they would provide some framework within which the teacher can perform and feel secure that there is a method that will succeed. By reducing the teacher's anxiety, arming him with tools expected to succeed, the added confidence may breed its own success regardless of the method itself.

Since teachers said that their expectations were met in the area of sharing with others, the format of future workshops could maximize this aspect. For example, more time could be allotted for questioning the keynote speaker. Also, the discussion groups could be smaller. Whereas fourteen members per group were anticipated, most discussion groups numbered in the twenties, which may have inhibited some teachers. It may have been more useful to have grouped together teachers of the same grade. Whereas the planning committee thought that a longitudinal look at aggressive behavior would be useful, more data might have been shared among and been more relevant to teachers of the same grade.

The usefulness of this research lies primarily in the data it provides concerning the general attitude held by teachers towards aggressive children. As mentioned, the teachers were inclined to be sympathetic towards the child when they thought about the inner feelings he experienced. They saw him as a lonely, sensitive, perceptive, unhappy individual concerned with what his peers and teachers thought of him.

However, the results indicated that the teachers were less sympathetic with the external behavior of this child; i.e., with his object relationships. Although the teachers could view the aggressive child as sensitive and

concerned about opinions of him held by others, they could also see him as inconsiderate, a bully, selfish and enjoying his "acting-out" behavior. These teachers considered such a child as perplexing to work with and his behavior as difficult to understand. Apparently often overwhelmed by a sense of frustration in dealing with this child in the classroom, these teachers felt helpless in eliciting positive responsiveness and cooperation from him and even assumed that he did not like them.

The teachers' responses as to how they would handle the aggressive child reflects an equally high level of frustration in selecting a method that will consistently work.

This sense of frustration and the set of expectancies about the aggressive child's behavior undoubtedly influence the teachers' approach to such children. The fact that the majority of these teachers expect the aggressive child to be unresponsive to them, difficult to manage, and not to like them most likely will influence the counter behavior of the child. Allport stated in 1924:

> "The attitudes which others have toward us, that is, their expectation that we shall react in a given manner tends to compel us to react in that manner."[1]

A more recent study by Rosenthal and Jacobsen confirms this observation. They showed that expectations by teachers of a student's performance influenced that pupil's actual achievement.

The teachers unwittingly may be emitting cues which set up certain expectancies to which the aggressive child responds. Conceivably, a vicious circle is being perpetuated in which the child initially responds in an aggressive manner. The teacher, therefore, assumes the expectation

of further acting-out behavior, and the child learns to continue to respond to this set. Put in another way, if the child does not respond to a teacher, the teacher becomes frustrated and interprets this behavior as the child not wanting help. This interpretation may relieve some of the teacher's guilt when he feels helpless in reaching this child. Yet, a negative response on the teacher's part to an apparent rejection by the child of help offered often becomes real overt rejection for both teacher and child, leading to further misperceptions and distancing between them.

The one area of significant change in teachers' attitudes on the post-workshop questionnaire was in a shift from thinking of the aggressive child as a bully to a more sympathetic view of him, no longer as a bully. While the statistical analysis of the pre- and post-correlated questionnaires revealed a significant change in direction of response on only the one question, this small matched sample of twenty-eight or forty percent cannot be assumed to be representative of the total population of teachers attending the second workshop. Therefore, little can be validly stated about the change or lack of change in attitude after the workshop experience for the <u>entire</u> teacher population.

This research effort failed to provide an adequate <u>evaluation</u> of the effect of the workshop on change in teachers' attitudes toward aggressive school children. The method used for obtaining anonymous matched pre- and post-questionnaires proved inadequate. The smallness of this matched group and the reduced number of the post-March workshop questionnaires which were returned may indicate a negative attitude towards filling out the questionnaires twice. Also, the difference in timing when the two workshop

participants received the questionnaires may have influenced the return rate. Another issue that may be raised as a limitation of this study is that of the adequacy of questionnaires in uncovering subtle changes in attitudes. Also, there may have been changes in the teachers' attitudes for which the questionnaires did not provide a focus.

It would be invalid to state that there was only one significant change in attitude across the entire teacher population. However, it can be stated for the twenty-eight matched sample that only one significant change in attitude was revealed. This result coupled with the fact that the majority of the teachers were disappointed in the focus of the content of the workshop suggests that a change in consultative efforts with schools by mental health workers in the future should be explored. Significant results of the total post-workshop questionnaires indicated that the teachers were quite sympathetic and aware of the inner feelings of the acting-out child. Therefore, rather than focusing in the future on this aspect of aggressive behavior, methods of intervention dealing directly with the overt behavior of the aggressive child might more profitably be offered to the teachers. The teachers were asking for techniques to apply in the management of this type of child. The mental health sponsors of the workshop did not respond sufficiently to this request. By equipping the teacher with technical methods designed to minimize disruptive behavior, such as behavior modification intervention or the life space interviewing technique, the teacher's expectations of further acting-out behavior undoubtedly would be reduced and the perpetuation of negative expectancies on the part of the teacher and child would be avoided. With

appropriate use of some of these techniques, the issue of the struggle for control would appear to be minimized.

An issue that this research poses for mental health personnel is whether they can shift their focus in order to meet the needs of the teachers more effectively. Can mental health persons address themselves to direct technical guidance in classroom management as desired by the teachers? Can specific techniques without an awareness of the contributing forces motivating the behavior be successful in the management of behavior? It is the opinion of the authors that an approach which combines the recognition of psychological forces motivating behavior with practical, concrete intervention techniques, such as behavior modification or life space interviewing, is more appropriate to offer the teachers than either approach alone. We feel a series of workshops meets the practical issue of cost and time and reaches a larger number of teachers.

The approach of the single child, case-oriented consultive work is not adequate enough for the teachers of our overcrowded urban schools. There is an ever increasing imbalance between the needs of the schools in the area of mental health and the availability of professional staff. The implication from the results of this study for mental health workers is that we not only must listen more attentively to the needs of the teachers, but be able to respond with creative, meaningful experiences and programs. The need for research on consultative efforts is emphasized as well since this is the only way that efforts can be objectively evaluated and consultation refined and revised to meet the needs of consultees.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allport, F., 1924, Social Psychology. Riverside Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 324-326

2. Berman, S., 1959, Antisocial Character Disorders. American Journal of Orthropsychiatry, 29: 612-621

3. Caplan, G., 1964, Principles of Preventive Psychiatry. Basic Books, New York

4. Johnson, A. and Szurek, S., 1952, The Genesis of Antisocial Acting Out in Children and Adults. Psychoanal. Quart. 21: 323-343

5. Liss, E., 1955, Motivations in Learning. In: Conflict in the Classroom, Long, Morse and Newmen (Ed.) Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, California, 345-352

6. Rexford, E., 1959, Antisocial Young Children and Their Families. In: Dynamic Psychopathology in Childhood, Jessner and Pawnstedt (Ed.) Grune and Stratton, New York, 186-220

7. Rosenthal, R., and Jacobsen, L., 1968, Pygmalion in the Classroom. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York

8. Siegel, S., 1956, Nonparametric Statistics. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 96-100; 175-179

9. Weiss, E., 1966, Application of Psychiatric Principles for Teachers. Childhood Education, 42: 553-557

APPENDIX

TABLE I

STATISTICS ON THE FORTY QUESTIONS ASSESSING TEACHERS' ATTITUDES

ACROSS THE TOTAL POST-WORKSHOP SAMPLES

Question No.	Frequency Yes	No	Undec.	Direction	Signif. Level	Question No.	Frequency Yes	No	Undec.	Direction	Signif. Level
1	99	27	26	Yes	.001	21	36	65	53	N.S.	N.S.
2	89	42	24	Yes	.001	22	36	83	34	No	.001
3	112	25	13	Yes	.001	23	13	110	28	No	.001
4	113	22	21	Yes	.001	24	104	26	24	Yes	.001
5	69	36	39	Yes	.01	25	22	94	39	No	.001
6	2	134	17	No	.001	26	53	46	45	N.S.	N.S.
7	118	12	23	Yes	.001	27	142	3	8	Yes	.001
8	72	37	38	Yes	.001	28	83	17	59	Yes	.001
9	67	44	41	Yes	.05	29	54	29	70	N.S.	N.S.
10	116	17	21	Yes	.001	30	38	44	69	N.S.	N.S.
11	1	18	30	No	.001	31	42	49	61	N.S.	N.S.
12	69	45	41	Yes	.05	32	63	31	62	N.S.	N.S.
13	45	59	44	N.S.	N.S.	33	34	65	54	N.S.	N.S.
14	80	44	30	Yes	.01	34	53	64	30	N.S.	N.S.
15	16	103	33	No	.001	35	94	34	23	Yes	.001
16	7	114	32	No	.001	36	65	50	37	N.S.	N.S.
17	73	50	31	Yes	.05	37	72	39	43	Yes	.001
18	127	7	24	Yes	.001	38	77	33	35	Yes	.001
19	107	22	25	Yes	.001	39	1	129	21	No	.001
20	1	138	18	No	.001	40	3	103	45	No	.001

TABLE II

STATISTICS COMPARING THE PRE AND POST-WORKSHOP SAMPLES ON THE FORTY QUESTIONS ASSESSING TEACHERS' ATTITUDES

Question No.	Jan. 30		Pre-March 20		Post March 20	
	Direction	Signif.	Direction	Signif.	Direction	Signif.
1	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
2	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
3	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
4	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
5	Yes	.05	Yes	.05	Yes	.02
6	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
7	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
8	Yes	.01	N.S.	N.S.	Yes	.01
9	Yes	.01	Yes	.001	N.S.	N.S.
10	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
11	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
12	N.S.	N.S.	Yes	.001	N.S.	N.S.
13	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
14	N.S.	N.S.	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
15	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
16	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
17	N.S.	N.S.	Yes	.001	Yes	.02
18	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
19	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
20	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

Question No.	Jan. 30		Pre-March 20		Post March 20	
	Direction	Signif.	Direction	Signif.	Direction	Signif.
21	No	.02	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
22	No	.05	No	.001	No	.001
23	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
24	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
25	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
26	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
27	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
28	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	N.S.	N.S.
29	Yes	.001	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
30	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
31	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
32	Yes	.02	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
33	N.S.	N.S.	No	.05	N.S.	N.S.
34	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
35	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
36	N.S.	N.S.	Yes	.001	Yes	.02
37	Yes	.05	Yes	.001	Yes	.02
38	Yes	.01	Yes	.001	Yes	.01
39	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
40	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001

TABLE III

STATISTICS COMPARING THE PRE AND POST MARCH 20th CORRELATED GROUP RESPONSES TO THE FORTY QUESTION ASSESSING TEACHERS' ATTITUDES

Question No.	Pre-Group Frequencies			Post-Group Frequencies			Signif. Diff.
	Yes	No	Undec.	Yes	No	Undec.	
1	23	3	2	20	3	1	N.S.
2	18	7	3	19	3	2	N.S.
3	22	4	1	13	7	3	N.S.
4	19	4	5	20	3	1	N.S.
5	11	7	9	17	2	5	N.S.
6	0	27	0	0	22	0	N.S.
7	22	5	1	18	4	1	N.S.
8	5	13	8	13	8	3	N.S.
9	18	5	4	6	10	7	.05
10	22	1	4	19	4	1	N.S.
11	0	23	5	0	18	6	N.S.
12	16	7	5	11	4	8	N.S.
13	13	10	3	9	8	6	N.S.
14	18	8	2	14	5	4	N.S.
15	3	23	2	3	16	4	N.S.
16	2	22	4	1	17	6	N.S.
17	17	8	3	17	3	3	N.S.
18	21	3	4	21	2	1	N.S.
19	17	7	3	17	3	4	N.S.
20	3	22	3	0	22	2	N.S.

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Question No.	Pre-Group Frequencies			Post-Group Frequencies			Signif. Diff.
	Yes	No	Undec.	Yes	No	Undec.	
21	12	9	6	5	8	11	N.S.
22	4	18	6	6	12	4	N.S.
23	3	22	3	2	19	2	N.S.
24	20	3	4	20	2	1	N.S.
25	4	19	5	2	16	6	N.S.
26	6	11	11	4	11	7	N.S.
27	27	2	0	22	1	0	N.S.
28	15	5	8	11	2	10	N.S.
29	11	8	9	3	6	14	N.S.
30	5	14	9	7	5	11	N.S.
31	6	12	8	5	9	9	N.S.
32	12	5	11	11	5	7	N.S.
33	5	11	12	2	14	7	N.S.
34	10	14	4	9	7	7	N.S.
35	22	6	0	15	6	2	N.S.
36	16	7	5	11	7	5	N.S.
37	13	9	6	11	7	5	N.S.
38	22	2	4	17	5	1	N.S.
39	0	24	4	0	18	5	N.S.
40	1	21	6	0	18	5	N.S.

TABLE IV

STATISTICS ON THE 18 MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS ACROSS THE TOTAL POST-WORKSHOP SAMPLES

Question No.	Frequency			Direction of Response	Signif. Level
	Yes	No	Undec.		
1	10	103	22	No	.001
2	54	47	33	N.S.	N.S.
3	80	31	16	Yes	.001
4	110	6	23	Yes	.001
5	36	60	36	No	.02
6	62	43	34	N.S.	N.S.
7	0	119	12	No	.001
8	13	89	30	No	.001
9	19	80	33	No	.001
10	129	2	9	Yes	.001
11	85	20	29	Yes	.001
12	116	10	11	Yes	.001
13	96	13	23	Yes	.001
14	88	8	40	Yes	.001
15	6	92	29	No	.001
16	127	3	12	Yes	.001
17	40	53	40	N.S.	N.S.
18	113	6	19	Yes	.001

TABLE V

STATISTICS COMPARING THE PRE AND POST-WORKSHOP SAMPLES ON THE EIGHTEEN QUESTIONS ASSESSING MANAGEMENT PREFERENCES

Question No.	January 30		Pre-March 20		Post March 20	
	Direction	Signif.	Direction	Signif.	Direction	Signif.
1	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
2	N.S.	N.S.	No	.001	N.S.	N.S.
3	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
4	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
5	N.S.	N.S.	No	.001	N.S.	N.S.
6	Yes	.05	Yes	.01	N.S.	N.S.
7	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
8	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
9	No	.001	No	.001	No	.05
10	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
11	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
12	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
13	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
14	Yes	.02	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
15	No	.001	No	.001	No	.001
16	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001
17	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
18	Yes	.001	Yes	.001	Yes	.001

TABLE VI

STATISTICS COMPARING THE PRE AND POST MARCH 20 CORRELATED GROUP RESPONSES TO THE 18 MANAGEMENT QUESTIONS

Question	Pre-Group Frequencies			Post-Group Frequencies			Signif. Diff.
No.	Yes	No	Undec.	Yes	No	Undec.	
1	4	20	2	1	13	5	N.S.
2	9	13	3	6	8	5	N.S.
3	17	5	3	11	5	4	N.S.
4	23	0	2	19	0	3	N.S.
5	5	15	5	7	9	3	N.S.
6	12	6	7	9	5	6	N.S.
7	0	23	2	0	20	0	N.S.
8	3	18	3	1	14	5	N.S.
9	6	14	4	6	8	5	N.S.
10	23	2	0	19	0	1	N.S.
11	15	7	4	12	3	6	N.S.
12	22	2	1	16	3	2	N.S.
13	18	6	2	15	2	3	N.S.
14	15	4	5	12	4	4	N.S.
15	3	17	5	2	13	4	N.S.
16	25	0	1	19	1	2	N.S.
17	8	14	4	6	10	4	N.S.
18	21	2	2	18	1	1	N.S.